

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.02, a district court reviews *de novo* any portion of a report and recommendation to which a specific objection is made. *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 603 (6th Cir. 2001). General or conclusory objections are insufficient. *See Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 F. Appx. 228, 230 (6th Cir. 2009). Thus, “only those specific objections to the magistrate’s report made to the district court will be preserved for appellate review.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987)). In conducting the review, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

II. ANALYSIS


If the Court construes Plaintiff's Response (Doc. No. 17) as objections to the R&R, the objections are timely. But even so, Plaintiff's Response does not directly challenge the reasoning of the R&R or lodge specific objections to the R&R. Instead, Plaintiff appears to simply re-state facts and arguments she previously made and the Magistrate Judge already considered in reaching her decision. Thus, Plaintiff's objections do not provide a basis to reject or modify the currently pending R&R.

III. CONCLUSION

Having reviewed the R&R and fully considered Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's objections are without merit, and the R&R (Doc. No. 16) should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Record (Doc. No. 14) is **DENIED**, and the decision of the Social Security Administration is **AFFIRMED**.

This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

It is so **ORDERED**.



WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE